

REMARKS

First, it is noted that an Associate Power of Attorney is being submitted with the present response.

With reference to page 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 21, 2001, fails to comply with 35 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each U.S. and foreign patent. Applicant notes that the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 21, 2001, included U.S. Patent No. 5,673,336 to Edgar et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,149,960 to Dunn et al. This Information Disclosure Statement has been considered by the Examiner based on the copy of the Information Disclosure Statement initialed and dated by the Examiner on June 10, 2003.

With respect to the Information Disclosure Statement issue, it is believed that the Examiner is referring to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 7, 2001, an initialed copy of which Applicant has not received with the Office Action. Applicant believes that copies of the references were filed with the Information Disclosure Statement of September 7, 2001. This is evidenced by the enclosed copies of the transmittal letter, the cover letter for the Information Disclosure Statement, and the return receipt post card dated September 10, 2001, which indicate that copies of references were also included with the Information Disclosure Statement. These patents now appear to be missing from the file. In order to expedite prosecution in the present application, Applicant is in the process of obtaining copies of the cited patents which will be forwarded to the Examiner under a separate cover letter.

Claims 1-46 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-14 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being drawn to a non-elected invention. Claims 15-40, 43 and 46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Edgar et al. '086. Claims 44-45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edgar '086.

With reference to the rejection of claims 15-40, 43 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Edgar et al. '086; and the rejection of claims 44-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Edgar '086, the reference to Edgar et al. '086 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by the claimed invention.

Claim 15 relates to a method for correcting image information associated with a plurality of information channels. The method of claim 15 comprises obtaining image information for a first information channel; obtaining image information from at least one additional information channel, wherein at least a portion of the information from the at least one additional information channel includes information associated with the information obtained from the

first channel; transforming the image information obtained from the at least one additional information channel to obtain transformed image information associated with the first channel; and combining at least a portion of the transformed image information associated with the first information channel with at least a portion of the information from the first information channel to obtain corrected image information associated with the first information channel.

Therefore, in a feature of the method of the present invention as required by claim 15, information from a first channel and from at least one additional information channel is obtained. The method further comprises transforming the image information obtained from the at least one additional channel and combining at least a portion of the transformed image information that is obtained from the at least one additional channel with at least a portion of the information from the first information channel. Therefore, in the method of claim 15, the information from the additional channel is transformed and combined with the information from the first information channel. This is not believed to be shown or suggested in the reference to Edgar et al '086. More specifically, the reference to Edgar et al '086 discloses a method for measuring and compensating for changes in the dye layers of film with aging. In the method of Edgar et al. '086, all of the information channels appear to be subjected to an autocorrelation as described, for example, in columns 9 and 10 of Edgar et al. '086. Further, Figures 6 and 7 of Edgar et al. '086 suggests that the red, green, blue and infrared channels are to be subjected to a linear transform. Therefore, the reference to Edgar et al. '086 is not believed to show or suggest the method of claim 15 including the step of transforming the image information obtained from the at least one additional information channel to obtain transformed image information; and combining at least a portion of the transformed image information with at least a portion of the information from the first information channel.

Accordingly, the reference to Edgar et al. '086 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the features of claim 15.

Claims 16-24 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 15 and set forth additional unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference. For example, claims 16-20 and 23-24 set forth further features of the transforming and image information obtaining steps; while claims 21-22 set forth that either the least one additional image information channel or the first channel is substantially unaltered before combining. The applied references are not believed to show or suggest these features of the present invention.

The same arguments as noted above with respect to claim 15 also apply to claim 25 which relates to a digital file tangibly embodied in a computer readable medium. Claim 25 requires the steps of transforming image information obtained from at least one additional information channel; and combining this information with at least a portion of information from a first information channel to obtain corrected image information. The reference to Edgar et al.'086 is not believed to show or suggest this feature of the present invention.

Claims 26-34 depend from claim 25 and set forth additional unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the applied reference. As an example, claim 30 requires that the image information obtained from the first information channel be substantially unaltered before combining. This feature as well as the other features of the above-noted dependent claims are not believed to be shown or suggested in the reference to Edgar et al. '086.


Claim 35 relates to an image processing system and requires that a program include instructions to enable the transformation of image information obtained from at least one additional channel to obtain transformed image information, and that this transformed information be combined with at least a portion of information obtained from a first information channel. For the reasons noted above with respect to claims 15 and 25, the reference to Edgar et al. '086 is not believed to show or suggest this feature of the present invention.

Claims 36-46 set forth additional unique features of the present invention which are also not believed to be shown or suggested in the reference to Edgar et al. '086.

Accordingly, the reference to Edgar et al. '086 is not believed to anticipate or make obvious the specific features required by claims 15-46.

In view of the foregoing comments, it is submitted that the inventions defined by each of claims 15-46 are patentable, and a favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,



David A. Novais
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,324

DAN/ld
Encs.
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: 585-588-2727
Facsimile: 585-477-1148